## REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 2 and 17 have been amended to address an informality.

Claims 2 and 17 are objected to because of an informality. Claims 1-30 are rejected. Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,979 to Cochran ("Cochran"). Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran in view of "Compliance Solutions." Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran and Compliance Solutions in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,842,219 to High, Jr. et al ("High").

### Objection to Claims 2 and 17

Claims 2 and 17 are objected to because claims 2 and 17 contain the acronym "OFAC." The Examiner suggests rewriting the acronym as "Office of Foreign Assets Control." Accordingly, claims 2 and 17 have been amended per the Examiner's suggestion to recite "Office of Foreign Assets Control." Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 2 and 17.

### Rejection of Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Cochran (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,979) ("Cochran"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The undersigned representative notes that the Examiner has reopened prosecution in view of the Appeal Brief and Arguments filed on April 5, 2007. *See* Office Action at 2. In reopening prosecution, this non-final Office Action recites that "new grounds of rejection as set forth here below." However, it appears as though the only difference between this Office Action and the one from which appeal was taken is that the rejection of claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 over Cochran is now in view of § 102(b) rather than § 103(a). Regardless of this statutory change, the rejection appears

to be identical and does not address the arguments in the Appeal Brief that caused the Examiner to reopen prosecution. Nevertheless, the undersigned representative incorporates the arguments from the Appeal Brief and has also additionally addressed these rejections in a fully responsive manner.

Cochran fails to disclose each and every element as required by a *prima facie* case of anticipation. First, Cochran does not disclose "searching financial transactions." Second, Cochran does not disclose "sanctioned entities." And third, Cochran does not disclose "identify[ing] the server being invoked among the plurality of servers."

Cochran does not disclose "searching financial transactions," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 16. Cochran's exemplary embodiment is a "travel search database." *See, e.g.*, Figs. 3-10; col. 6, lines 58-64. Planning travel accommodations is distinct from "financial transactions." In order to meet the requirements for a prima *facie* case of anticipation, Cochran's recitation of searching a database does not disclose "searching financial transactions." The Examiner's citation to Cochran fails to disclose "searching financial transactions." In fact, Cochran fails to disclose anywhere "searching financial transactions," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 16.

Cochran does not disclose "sanctioned entities," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 16. A "sanctioned entity" can be an entity or its agent where the United States has imposed restrictions, such as a commercial, financial, or other economic sanction. *See, e.g.*, Page 1. Cochran fails to disclose a "sanctioned entity" anywhere, including the Examiner's cited portion.

Cochran does not disclose "identify the server being invoked among the plurality of servers," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 16. Cochran transmits the list identifiers from the server to the user. Col. 7, lines 9-18 ("The information transmitted from server 710 to the user's computer 720 includes a plurality of list identifiers and lists of search terms associated with those list identifiers."). As a result, the user only searches the server that transmitted the list identifiers. The user in Cochran is unable to "identify the server" because only one

server is being searched. Thus, Cochran has no need to identify the server. In contrast, claim 1 recites "the network including a plurality of servers accessible by a plurality of user terminals." Unlike Cochran, the user terminals access more than one server ("the network including a plurality of servers") and, therefore, have a desire to "identify the server being invoked," whereas there is no identification when only one server is present. Indeed, because Cochran recites the use of only one server, Cochran cannot meet the *prima facie* case of anticipation under § 102 and disclose "identify the server being invoked among the plurality of servers," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 16.

For at least the reasons stated above, as well as the reasons stated in the prior response, Cochran does not disclose independent claims 1 or 16 of the present application. Therefore, the undersigned respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 16 are allowable over the cited art. Further, dependent claims 10-15 and 25-30 are also allowable as they contain the limitations of the claims on which they depend.

Thus, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30.

**Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 17-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran in view of "Compliance Solutions." This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are dependent upon claims 1 and 16 which are submitted to be allowable in view of Cochran for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 17-20 should be allowable under Cochran for these reasons as well. Further arguments are reserved with respect to dependent claims 2-5 and 17-20. Because "Compliance Solutions" does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Cochran, claims 2-5 and 17-20 are not obvious in view of the cited references and should therefore be allowed. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-5 and 17-20.

**Rejection of Claims 6-9 and 21-24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran and "Compliance Solutions" in view of High, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,842,219) ("High"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are dependent upon claims 1 and 16 which are submitted to be allowable in view of Cochran for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 6-9 and 21-24 should be allowable under Cochran for these reasons as well. Further arguments are reserved with respect to dependent claims 6-9 and 21-24. Because "Compliance Solutions" and High do not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Cochran, claims 6-9 and 21-24 are not obvious in view of the cited references and should therefore be allowed.

## CONCLUSION

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filling of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account 50-4402.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 2, 2007
KING & SPALDING LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-8980

By: */Eric L. Sophir - Reg. #48,499/*
Eric L. Sophir
Registration No. 48,499